



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES OF CASES.

A PURCHASE at a tax sale by a devisee of a life estate in remainder is held, in *Defreese v. Lake* (Mich.), 32 L. R. A. 744, ineffectual to cut off the remainders limited upon such life estate. The case has a note collecting the authorities on the duty of life tenants to pay taxes.

A delinquent-tax sale for failure of a life tenant to pay taxes is held, in *Estabrook v. Royon* (Ohio), 32 L. R. A. 805, to cause no forfeiture of his estate, where by reason of errors or irregularities a valid deed on the tax sale cannot be made. A note to this case presents the authorities on the effect of a tax sale on land held by a life tenant.

In this connection see Virginia Code of 1887, sec. 661, providing that "Nothing in this section shall be so construed as to affect, or divest, the title of a tenant in reversion or remainder to any real estate which has been returned delinquent and sold on account of the default of the tenant for life in paying the taxes or levies assessed thereon."

GAME LAWS.—The strong leaning of the courts toward upholding the game laws, is illustrated by the recent case of *Haggerty v. St. Louis Ice etc. Co.* (Mo.), 44 S. W. 1114. The defendant was engaged in the business of cold storage, and the plaintiff was a dealer in game. The defendant contracted with the plaintiff to preserve in the former's cold storage warehouse, during the close season, a large quantity of dead game, lawfully acquired by the plaintiff during the open season, and to restore it to the plaintiff in good condition at the beginning of the next open season. At the end of the period, the game was found to be unfit for use, whereupon the plaintiff sued for damages. The defendant successfully defended the action, on the ground that the Missouri statute prohibited the killing, or having in possession, of any game of the character of that which constituted the subject matter of the contract—notwithstanding it was lawfully purchased during an open season; affirming *Phelps v. Racey*, 60 N. Y. 10. The subject is discussed in 3 Va. Law Reg. 540.

INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR—DANGEROUS PREMISES.—The recent Virginia case of *Richmond etc. R. Co. v. Moore*, 3 Va. Law Reg. 572 (27 S. E. 70), has been almost precisely duplicated in the more recent case of *Thompson v. Lowell etc. R. Co.*, 49 N. E. 913 (April 11, 1898), in the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts. In the Virginia case the street railway company, to attract custom over its line of road, advertised a free balloon ascension at a park under its management; the company had no control over the aeronaut or his apparatus. As the balloon was released for the ascent, certain poles, used in keeping it erect while being filled with gas, were released at the same time, one of which fell upon and killed a boy in the surrounding crowd.

In the Massachusetts case the advertised attraction was target shooting by a man without arms or hands. As in the Virginia case, the premises belonged to or were under control of the railway company, and the exhibition was given by an independent contractor. By reason of the negligence of the latter, the plain-